United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois



						\ \		
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge CASE NUMBER			B. Moran	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge				
		01	C 7007	DATE	9/2	1/2001		
CASE TITLE			Sheila Zinnermon vs. City of Chicago etc.					
MO	OTION:	[In the following box (of the motion being p	(a) indicate the party filing the resented.]	e motion, e.g., plaintiff, def	endant, 3rd party plaintiff, a	nd (b) state briefly the natur		
			Memorandum O	pinion and Order				
DO	CKET ENTRY:							
(1)	☐ Filed	l motion of [use listi	ng in "Motion" box ab	ove.]		·		
(2)	☐ Brief	Brief in support of motion due						
(3)	□ Ansv	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due						
(4)								
(5)		Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(7)		Trial[set for/re-set for] on at						
(8)	☐ [Bene	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at						
(9)	□ This	This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] □ FRCP4(m) □ General Rule 21 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FRCP41(a)(2).						
(10)								
					4			
(11)) = [For f	further detail see orde	er attached to the origin	nal minute order.]				
	No notices required, a	advised in open court.				Document		
No notices required.				number of notices	Number			
Notices mailed by judge's staff.								
	Notified counsel by telephone.				SEP 2 A 2 1 0 1 date docketed			
V	Docketing to mail notices. Mail AO 450 form.		9 UU-7		ر . ر			
	Copy to judge/magistrate judge.		Face FUR 900K	ETING	docketing deput initials			
	WAH	courtroom deputy's	UISEP 21 PH	ls: ls2	date mailed notice			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		initials	Date/time r	oosirad in				

central Clerk's Office

mailing deputy initials

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

SHEILA ZINNERMON,)	Na Ca Ca Ca ar receive a
Plaintiff,)	DUTKETEL
vs.	No. 01 C 7007	SEP 2.4 2001
CITY OF CHICAGO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,))) SEP 24	2009
Defendant.)	2001

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff, a former probationary police officer, claims that she was discharged in retaliation for reporting police misconduct by two other officers. Charges against one of the officers are to be heard by the Police Board on September 25, 2001. Plaintiff has been subpoenaed to testify at the hearing. She moves for a protective order precluding any inquiry of her at that hearing. The motion is denied.

This is not a case in which a plaintiff brings a constitutional challenge to a state administrative hearing. Rather, she claims that requiring her testimony by attorneys who represent the defendant in her case, without her attorney being present, is unfair and prejudicial to her. We think the principles developed in cases involving constitutional challenges apply with even greater force here. A municipality has a strong interest in the full adjudication of charges of misconduct by a police officer. A federal court should not intervene absent a demonstrated bias by the hearing tribunal, and we question whether federal intervention is warranted even then since the state courts are available for any redress that may be appropriate. See Ohio Civil Rights Commission v. Dayton Christian Schools, Inc., 477 U.S. 619 (1986).

JAMES B. MORAN Senior Judge, U. S. District Court

Sept 21, 2001